

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

ROBERT J. MURRAY,

Plaintiff,

v.

GENE CLARK, *et al.*,

Defendants.

No. 4:21-CV-00122

(Chief Judge Brann)

**ORDER**

**JUNE 1, 2022**

**AND NOW**, upon consideration of Plaintiff's second motion<sup>1</sup> renewing his request for appointment of counsel, and the Court observing that appointment of counsel was conditionally granted but no *pro bono* counsel was able to be obtained,<sup>2</sup> and further observing that this Court recently denied Plaintiff's first motion renewing his request for appointment of counsel,<sup>3</sup> **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that Plaintiff's motion (Doc. 59) for appointment of counsel is **DENIED**. The Court will not entertain any further requests for appointment of counsel in this case.<sup>4</sup>

BY THE COURT:

*s/ Matthew W. Brann*

Matthew W. Brann

Chief United States District Judge

---

<sup>1</sup> Doc. 59.

<sup>2</sup> See Docs. 29, 32.

<sup>3</sup> See Docs. 39, 40.

<sup>4</sup> Plaintiff is admonished that this Court has no authority to order private counsel to represent him in this civil case, either on a *pro bono* or contingency-fee basis. The Court has already attempted to obtain counsel for Plaintiff, but no willing counsel could be located. If Plaintiff desires to attempt to secure counsel to represent him in this matter, he is free to do so. Otherwise, he must continue to prosecute this case *pro se*.